

S-wave contact interaction problem: A simple description

Shina Tan

James Franck Institute and Department of Physics, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

The s-wave contact interaction problem has a very simple structure and a simple and straightforward description. This is not a standard paper, and technicalities are avoided. A *bare* and *simple* picture of the problem is presented, in the hope that it will be helpful to our theoretical study of the problem.

Keywords: s-wave contact interaction, Feshbach resonance, resonant interaction, ultracold gas

The s-wave contact interaction, or s-wave resonant interaction, is purely a quantum mechanical effect, and has no classical counterpart, unlike the Coulomb interaction. This concept (s-wave contact interaction) however has such a broad range of applications that numerous theoretical and experimental papers are published, which are closely related to it. In this regard, it is not unlike the Coulomb interaction.

Two nonrelativistic particles in three-dimensional space are said to have s-wave contact interaction if they satisfy the following conditions:

- they have no direct interaction, if their distance *or* relative orbital angular momentum is nonzero;
- the s-wave component (ie, spherically symmetric component) of their *relative* wave function obeys a simple *linear* boundary condition at zero distance, as below.

For simplicity, we consider particles of *equal* mass m , and use the natural unit $\hbar = 1$. Generalizations to unequal masses and/or restoration of $\hbar$ is easy.

We first omit the center-of-mass degree of freedom, and concentrate on the relative motion. The Schrödinger equation is

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\psi = -\frac{1}{m}\nabla^2\psi \quad (r > 0), \quad (1)$$

where $\psi = \psi(\mathbf{r}, t)$, $\mathbf{r}$ is the relative wave vector of the two particles, and t is time. $r = |\mathbf{r}|$ is the distance between the particles.

At short distances $r \rightarrow 0$, we can omit the energy, and obtain an even simpler equation, $-\nabla^2\psi = 0$. Different partial waves, associated with different angular momentum quantum numbers l , are decoupled: $\psi = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \psi_l$, such that

$$-\frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}r^2\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\psi_l + \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2}\psi_l = 0,$$

and thus $\psi_l = A_l(\hat{\mathbf{r}})r^l + B_l(\hat{\mathbf{r}})r^{-l-1}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{r}} \equiv \mathbf{r}/r$ is the direction of $\mathbf{r}$. Since there is *no interaction in channels of nonzero angular momenta*, $B_l(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = 0$ for $l > 0$. In the s-wave channel, however, the interaction is defined by a linear *constraint* on A_0 and B_0 :

$$A_0 + \frac{B_0}{a} = 0, \quad (2)$$

and here enters the *scattering length* a ; we assume it is a nonzero constant; it is either positive or negative, or even infinity (the so-called *unitarity limit*). a is the only *parameter characterizing the s-wave contact interaction*. Equation (2), as simple as it is, is of *paramount importance* in the s-wave contact interaction problem. Note also that *the s-wave contact interaction can not exist between identical fermions*; for other particle pairs (including a pair of fermions at different internal states), such interaction is allowed.

Now the wave function is generally of the form

$$\psi(\mathbf{r}, t) = B_0(t) \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{a} \right) + O(r) \quad (r \rightarrow 0). \quad (3)$$

To facilitate the study of much more complicated cases, in which a few or many particles participate in the s-wave contact interactions, we introduce the short-range *selectors* $\lambda(\mathbf{r})$ and $l(\mathbf{r})$ [1] [this $l(\mathbf{r})$ happens to involve the same English letter as the angular momentum, unfortunately], whose role is to selectively pick up the short-range behavior of the wave function (or some other functions that may arise in the problem). These selectors are possible if we have the general notion that mathematical tools (as well as any *physical* concepts) can be freely reshaped to suit our needs:

- truth value (namely the proposed theory, in its range of validity, must not contradict our experience);
- coherence and simplicity (Ockham's razor);
- ease to handle (namely the logical path from theory to experience should be shortened as much as possible).

Here are the basic properties of these selectors:

$$\lambda(\mathbf{r}) = l(\mathbf{r}) = 0 \quad (\mathbf{r} \neq 0), \quad (4a)$$

$$\int d^3r \lambda(\mathbf{r}) = 1, \quad \int d^3r \frac{\lambda(\mathbf{r})}{4\pi r} = 0, \quad (4b)$$

$$\int d^3r l(\mathbf{r}) = 0, \quad \int d^3r \frac{l(\mathbf{r})}{4\pi r} = 1, \quad (4c)$$

$$\int d^3r \lambda(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\mathbf{r}} = \int d^3r l(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\mathbf{r}} = 0. \quad (4d)$$

These selectors have momentum representations:

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{k}) = \int d^3r \lambda(\mathbf{r}) \exp(-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}), \quad (5a)$$

$$L(\mathbf{k}) = \int d^3r l(\mathbf{r}) \exp(-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}), \quad (5b)$$

and they have properties

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{k}) = 1 \quad (|\mathbf{k}| < \infty), \quad (6a)$$

$$\int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\Lambda(\mathbf{k})}{k^2} = 0, \quad (6b)$$

$$\Lambda(-\mathbf{k}) = \Lambda(\mathbf{k}); \quad (6c)$$

$$L(\mathbf{k}) = 0 \quad (|\mathbf{k}| < \infty), \quad (6d)$$

$$\int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{L(\mathbf{k})}{k^2} = 1, \quad (6e)$$

$$L(-\mathbf{k}) = L(\mathbf{k}). \quad (6f)$$

These equations are *not* contradictory, because

$$\int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\Lambda(\mathbf{k})}{k^2} \neq \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|\mathbf{k}| < K} \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\Lambda(\mathbf{k})}{k^2},$$

$$\int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{L(\mathbf{k})}{k^2} \neq \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \int_{|\mathbf{k}| < K} \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{L(\mathbf{k})}{k^2},$$

in contrast with the traditional notion about integrals.

These two selectors span a linear space, called the *selector space*.

Finally, we define the important η -selector, which lies in the selector space,

$$\tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{r}) = \lambda(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{l(\mathbf{r})}{4\pi a}, \quad (7a)$$

$$\eta(\mathbf{k}) = \Lambda(\mathbf{k}) + \frac{L(\mathbf{k})}{4\pi a}, \quad (7b)$$

and it satisfies the important equation

$$\int d^3r \tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{r}) \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{a} \right) = 0, \quad (8)$$

but for functions that are nonsingular at $\mathbf{r} = 0$, $\tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{r})$ behaves like the delta function.

Equation (2) can now be written as

$$\int d^3r \tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{r}) \psi(\mathbf{r}, t) = 0, \quad (9)$$

which will play a crucial role in the s-wave contact interaction problem.

We now return to Eq. (1). Because the wave function has a singular term B_0/r , the kinetic energy operator produces a term $4\pi B_0 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{r})/m$, which has to be canceled, if we want to make the Schrödinger equation valid for all $\mathbf{r}$. The simplest way to do this is to use the L -selector,

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(\mathbf{r}, t) = -\frac{\nabla^2}{m} \psi(\mathbf{r}, t) - \frac{1}{m} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}) \int d^3r' l(\mathbf{r}') \psi(\mathbf{r}', t), \quad (10)$$

which must be solved in conjunction with Eq. (9) in order to determine the wave function.

There is also a simple way to *combine* the above equations

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(\mathbf{r}, t) = -\frac{\nabla^2}{m} \psi(\mathbf{r}, t) + \frac{1}{m} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}) \int d^3r' [-l(\mathbf{r}') + \zeta \tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{r}')] \psi(\mathbf{r}', t), \quad (11)$$

whose solutions necessarily satisfy *both* Eq. (9) and Eq. (10). Here ζ is any *nonzero* length.

The selectors $-L + \zeta \eta$, for all values of ζ , form a straight line in the selector space, and I call it *Olshanii-Pricoupenko straight line*. Simple mathematics shows that Eq. (1) of Ref. [2] exactly corresponds to this line.

Note that our Λ -selector is a completely different thing from the momentum scale “ Λ ” in [2] or in any other papers.

The momentum scale “ Λ ” in [2] is related to the length ζ : “ Λ ” = $1/a - 4\pi/\zeta$.

The Olshanii-Pricoupenko pseudopotential is now expressed in terms of the selectors as

$$V^\zeta(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \frac{1}{m} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}) [-l(\mathbf{r}') + \zeta \tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{r}')], \quad (12)$$

and, in particular, when $\zeta = 4\pi a$, we get back to the Fermi pseudopotential, which can now be expressed as

$$V(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \frac{4\pi a}{m} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}) \lambda(\mathbf{r}'), \quad (13a)$$

whose momentum representation is simply

$$V(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}') = \frac{4\pi a}{m} \Lambda(\mathbf{k}'). \quad (13b)$$

It was first noted by Olshanii-Pricoupenko [2] that the Fermi pseudopotential is a special case of many equivalent choices.

Such equivalence is due to the fact that the wave function satisfies the constraint Eq. (9).

The new insights that we have are:

- the short-range behavior of the wave function is confined in a linear space (and is subject to an additional linear constraint);
- we can construct its *dual linear space*, called the *selector space*, whose elements are called the selectors;
- each selector corresponds to a well-defined generalized function, and transformation between different representations (eg, between coordinate space and momentum space) is easy and straightforward;
- this allows us to formulate the *whole* problem in a *simple, unified, and flexible* way, and significantly facilitates our study of the whole system;

- the old forms of the pseudopotentials in terms of partial derivatives are both inelegant and not flexible (for example, no one was ever able to transform them to the other representations), and are no longer needed, once the selectors are clearly defined.

We now proceed to a system of fermions in two “opposite” “spin” states, subject to some external potential V_{ext} ; the s-wave contact interaction is present between the opposite spin states. The system is described by two equations:

$$\int d^3r \tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{\uparrow}(\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{r}/2) \psi_{\downarrow}(\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{r}/2) |\phi\rangle = 0, \quad (14a)$$

$$H = \sum_{\sigma} \int d^3r \psi_{\sigma}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r}) [-\nabla^2/2m + V_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r})] \psi_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) - \frac{1}{m} \int d^3r d^3r' \psi_{\uparrow}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{\downarrow}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r}') \psi_{\downarrow}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'/2) \psi_{\uparrow}(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}'/2) l(\mathbf{r}'), \quad (14b)$$

where $|\phi\rangle$ is any physically allowed state. We can of course combine the two equations as previously.

It is shown in [1] that the energy of the system can be exactly expressed in terms of the one-particle reduced density matrix only:

$$E = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \eta(\mathbf{k}) \frac{k^2}{2m} n_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + \sum_{\sigma} \int d^3r V_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}) \rho_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (15)$$

where $n_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ and $\rho_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r})$ are the momentum distribution and number density distribution, respectively. Note that $\eta(\mathbf{k}) = +1$ for any finite $\mathbf{k}$, but the peculiar behavior of $\eta(\mathbf{k})$ upon integration allows the existence of *negative* energy states, including the two-body bound states.

Equation (14a) directly leads to many identities that must be satisfied by various reduced density matrices; see [1] for details.

The same approach can also be used to study the Bose gas with s-wave contact interaction. However, the same level of completeness will *not* be reached until we also treat the Efimov effect, *inherent* in this system, clearly. This issue was not noticed in [2].

Generalization of this formalism to *two* dimensions is easy. The relative wave function is of the form $B_0 \ln(r/a)$ plus higher order terms at short distances. We can therefore define two selectors $\tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{r})$ and $l(\mathbf{r})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^2r \tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{r}) &= 1, & \int d^2r \tilde{\eta}(\mathbf{r}) (2\pi)^{-1} \ln(a/r) &= 0, \\ \int d^2r l(\mathbf{r}) &= 0, & \int d^2r l(\mathbf{r}) (2\pi)^{-1} \ln(a/r) &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

and $\lambda(\mathbf{r}) = l(\mathbf{r}) = 0$ for $\mathbf{r} \neq 0$. Their Fourier transforms can be shown to satisfy:

$$\eta(\mathbf{k}) = 1 \quad (|\mathbf{k}| < \infty), \quad (16a)$$

$$\int_{|\mathbf{k}| > K} \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\eta(\mathbf{k})}{k^2} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \ln \frac{2e^{-\gamma}}{Ka} \doteq \frac{1}{2\pi} \ln \frac{1.1229}{Ka}, \quad (16b)$$

$$L(\mathbf{k}) = 0 \quad (|\mathbf{k}| < \infty), \quad (16c)$$

$$\int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{L(\mathbf{k})}{k^2} = 1, \quad (16d)$$

where $\gamma = 0.5772 \dots$ is Euler’s constant, and K is any positive momentum scale.

Now the two-component Fermi gas in two dimensions with s-wave contact interaction satisfies two equations which look *formally identical* with Eqs. (14a) and (14b), except that the three-dimensional spatial integrals are replaced by two-dimensional ones.

Using the logic similar to that in [1], we can show that the two-dimensional system satisfies the energy theorem

$$E = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \eta(\mathbf{k}) \frac{k^2}{2m} n_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + \sum_{\sigma} \int d^2r V_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}) \rho_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (17)$$

which looks almost identical with its three-dimensional counterpart, except that now the meaning of $\eta(\mathbf{k})$ is different.

This formalism is much more straightforward than the one used in [3]. Also the energy theorem is unknown to people before.

As soon as we modify the traditional notion about integrals, in the way demonstrated in [1] and here, the ultraviolet divergence problems suddenly disappear.

While this approach is certainly not the first one which removes ultraviolet divergence problems, a lot of advantages exist in this formalism. Let us compare it with two other approaches:

- the traditional pseudopotential approach, which has been further developed by Olshanii and others [2];
- the bare coupling constants plus dimensional regularization plus renormalization approach.

The first approach never gained the flexibility to reach a simple momentum representation. The second approach, confined by the traditional notion of integrals, involves complicated intermediate steps (in which the dimensionality of the system has to be changed), divergent bare coupling constants, and subtraction procedures after the regularizations, and is thus a long detour to a simple problem.

The s-wave contact interaction problems, in both three and two dimensions, are now formulated easily with the short range selectors, and other known approaches can hardly compete with it in this area. The author however

does not exclude the possibility of the appearance of a still simpler *new* approach.

Whether the ideas here can be further extended to other important systems, in particular relativistic quantum field theories (in which the divergent bare coupling constants plus dimensional regularization plus renormalization approach currently dominates), remains an open question for the moment. We will get an answer to this question, either positive or negative.

Finally, let us discuss a little bit about some ideas underlying the present approach. Since the prospects of this approach beyond the current two systems are still not clear, any discussion here should be regarded as rather tentative.

The traditional notion about integrals can be illustrated with a simple example, $\int d^3k/k^2$, which contains divergent contribution from large $\mathbf{k}$. Here $\mathbf{k}$ is either momentum, or *spatial vector*, or even some other quantity. Let us assume it is momentum from this point on. This apparent divergence seems to stem from an assumption, namely that *any short-distance physics, including Planck scale physics, and maybe even beyond Planck momen-*

*tum, is **really** there, **actively** underlying that cloud of ultracold atoms, even when we have not fed any particles with very large energies.* An even deeper assumption underneath this one, is *reductionism: short-range physics completely determines long-range physics, and the former is more fundamental than the latter.* Whether these assumptions are valid, is of course a question beyond the scope of this tiny article, and we shall not attempt to discuss it further here.

The intuition that we have gained from our new generalized functions is: short-range physics *emerges* when we accelerate particles to its associated energy scale; whether it is really there, *before* we accelerate particles to that energy scale, seems to be a philosophical question - neither provable nor disprovable. However, in the present approach, the short-range physics appears to be somehow *activated* or maybe, more strangely, *created*, after the particles are raised to high energies. Is this picture an illusion caused by this mathematical method, or does it suggest some element of truth?

The author is indebted to Z. Q. Ma and C. Chin for some discussions.

[1] Shina Tan, cond-mat/0505200.

[2] M. Olshanii and L. Pricoupenko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 010402 (2002).

[3] L. Pricoupenko, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 013601 (2004).